

⁶ *De assib. sup.* believe with explicite Faith: and *Connink* ⁶ asserts the contrary
disp. 4. dub. 9. Opinion of some Canonists to be held erroneous and even he-
 retical by the other Doctors. Further, all consent there are
 some points of Faith necessary to be believed by all with expli-
 cite Faith, not only because commanded to be so; but because
 the explicite belief of them is also the means, without which
 Salvation cannot be obtained. Wherefore *Hosius* 7, in relating
 the known story of the Collier, saith, he did not make that
 Answer, of believing as the Church believeth, before he had
 entirely repeated the Apostles Creed, and professed his adhe-
 rence to it. Now suppose the Bishops differ about some Article
 necessary to be believed with explicite Faith, as happened in the
 times of *Arianism*. Certainly the Faithful cannot at that time
 suspend their assent, if they do not together suspend their hopes
 of Salvation. But not to insist upon that Example, suppose a
 Controversie raised about doing somewhat, which God in the
 Scripture expressly commands to be done, such as we contend to
 be Communion under both kinds, reading of the Scripture, &c.
 What is then to be done? Must all action be suspended? This
 were to deny obedience to God. We must therefore chuse one
 part, and so reject the pretence of implicate Faith. Again, im-
 plicate Faith is thus expressed, *I believe what the Church believeth*.
 It therefore supposeth the Faith of the Church. Of what kind?
 not implicate surely. For that would be absurd in the highest
 degree. Certainly then the Church could not justly be accounted
 the Keeper of Tradition, which is nothing else in our Adver-
 saries sence, but that Doctrine which Christ delivered to his Apo-
 stles, they to their Successors, until it was derived down to us.
 If this be true, the Church of every Age must of necessity dis-
 tinctly and explicitly know that Doctrine. Otherwise it cannot
 faithfully and accurately deliver it to the succeeding Church.
 Then how shall this Faith of the Church her self be expressed?
 It can be by no other Form than this, *I believe what I believe*;
 than which nothing can be more absurd. But I need not refuse
 a Folly which our Adversaries do not espouse, as appears from
 the words of *Duwall* ⁸: *Although some things were in process of time*
defined by the Church, which were before doubted of without the

⁷ *Hes. contra*
Profl. Brent.
lib. 3.

⁸ *Quamvis ali-*
qua successu
temporis fuerint

in Ecclesia definita, de quibus antea citra haresin dubitabatur, certum tamen est illa fuisse semper
a nonnullis predicata & declarata. Quod autem ab aliis non crederentur, istud tantum vel ex ob-
livione vel ex ignorantia Scripturae aut traditionis proveniebat. Duval. in 2.2. p. 111.

⁶ *De assib. sup.* believe with explicite Faith: and *Connink* ⁶ asserts the contrary *disp. 4. dub. 9.* Opinion of some Canonists to be held erroneous and even heretical by the other Doctors. Further, all consent there are some points of Faith necessary to be believed by all with explicite Faith, not only because commanded to be so; but because the explicite belief of them is also the means, without which

⁷ *Hef. contra*
Profl. Brent.
lib. 3.

Salvation cannot be obtained. Wherefore *Hosius* 7, in relating the known story of the Collier, saith, he did not make that Answer, of believing as the Church believeth, before he had entirely repeated the Apostles Creed, and professed his adherence to it. Now suppose the Bishops differ about some Article necessary to be believed with explicite Faith, as happened in the times of *Arianism*. Certainly the Faithful cannot at that time suspend their assent, if they do not together suspend their hopes of Salvation. But not to insist upon that Example, suppose a Controversie raised about doing somewhat, which God in the Scripture expressly commands to be done, such as we contend to be Communion under both kinds, reading of the Scripture, &c. What is then to be done? Must all action be suspended? This were to deny obedience to God. We must therefore chuse one part, and so reject the pretence of implicate Faith. Again, implicate Faith is thus expressed, *I believe what the Church believeth*. It therefore supposeth the Faith of the Church. Of what kind? not implicate surely. For that would be absurd in the highest degree. Certainly then the Church could not justly be accounted the Keeper of Tradition, which is nothing else in our Adversaries sence, but that Doctrine which Christ delivered to his Apostles, they to their Successors, until it was derived down to us. If this be true, the Church of every Age must of necessity distinctly and explicitly know that Doctrine. Otherwise it cannot faithfully and accurately deliver it to the succeeding Church. Then how shall this Faith of the Church her self be expressed? It can be by no other Form than this, *I believe what I believe*; than which nothing can be more absurd. But I need not refuse a Folly which our Adversaries do not espouse, as appears from the words of *Duwall* ⁸: *Although some things were in process of time defined by the Church, which were before doubted of without the*

⁸ *Quamvis aliquo successu temporis fuerint*

in Ecclesia definita, de quibus antea citra haresin dubitabatur, certum tamen est illa fuisse semper a nonnullis predicata & declarata. Quod autem ab aliis non crederentur, istud tantum vel ex obliuione vel ex ignorantia Scripturae aut traditionis proveniebat. Duval. in 2.2. p. 111.

Crime

of the Church of ROME.

Crime of Heresie, yet it is certain they were always preached and declared by some. But that they were not believed by others, arose either from the forgetfulness, or from the ignorance of Scripture or Tradition.

Is it therefore this explicite Faith of the Church, which serveth as a Foundation to implicate Faith? So it ought to be, and so I doubt not but our Adversaries will say it is. But in this case, wherein the Governours of the Church dissent about an Article of Faith, it cannot be. For that which the Church explicitly believes, is no definite Opinion, but a meer Contradiction repugnant to it self, and destroying it self. For one part of the Church believeth the Opinion, whereof the Controversie is raised, to be true, wholsom, and revealed by God; the other part believes it false, pernicious, and suggested by Men. Now, to have the belief of the whole Church, you must joyn both parts of the Contradiction together: and so the Church believeth that Opinion to be true and false, wholsom and pernicious, revealed by God, and suggested by Men. But this is not Faith, but a deformed Monster, consisting of contrary and repugnant parts.

CHAP. XXI.

That the consent of Doctors, even when it can be had, is more difficult to be known, than that we can by the help of it attain to the knowledge of the Truth.

TO what we observed in the precedent Chapter our Adversaries may perhaps answer, That when the Governours of the Church differ about a matter to be believed, then indeed the Faith of private Christians cannot rely upon their Authority; but that this dissent is not perpetual, that they oftentimes consent in delivering the Doctrine of the Church, and then at least may be securely believed in what they teach. To this I reply, First, that hereby they must grant they have no certain and fixed Rule of Faith for many great and weighty points of Religion, contrary to their continual boasts of the abundance of

of Rules, whereby God hath provided for all the necessities of his Church. Secondly, the Governours of the Church have now for many Ages differed about some matters, upon which, according to our Adversaries, depend the hopes of eternal Salvation. For Example, whether the true Church is to be found among the *Greeks* or among the *Latins*? For of the five Patriarchates of the Church, four are divided from the Church of *Rome*, and accuse her of *Heretic* and *Schism*, both which Accusations she retorts upon them. Now, this is a matter of great moment, which may be justly doubted of, and can never be determined by the consent of Doctors.

But to omit that, this consent, if it could be had, is not so manifest and obvious, as a Rule of Faith ought necessarily to

¹ *Secunda conditio, eaque pariter essentialis, est perspicuitas. Nam si hac regula obscure fidei mysteria proponeret, regula fidei non foret. Duwall in 2. 2. p. 207.*

be; which by the confession of all must be clear, evident, and easie to be applied. This *Duwall*¹ assigns for an essential condition of a Rule of Faith, and acknowledgeth, that if a Rule obscurely proposeth the Mysteries of Faith, it would thereby become no Rule. And for this reason our Adversaries

so much exaggerate the obscurity of Scripture, that they may thereby shew it could not be given by God for a Rule of Faith. To which end, *Gr. a Valentia*² layeth down this Axiom, which he afterwards applyeth to the Scripture. The Sentence of that Authority which is to judge of all matters of Faith, ought to be manifest, that it may be easily understood by all the Faithful. For if that Authority doth not teach perspicuously and plainly, it will be of no

² *Sententiam ejus auctoritatis, cuius de rebus omnibus fidei judicium est, apertam oportet esse, ut ab omnibus fidelibus commodè possit intelligi. Nam si non ita perspicue & planè auctoritas illa doceat, non ad eam rem valebit. Val. tom. 3. disp. 1. qu. 1. punct. 7. §. 4.*

use to that end. So he, and with him many others. If therefore I shall shew, that the consent of Pastors about matters of belief is so obscure and difficult to be known, that even the most learned, much more illiterate men cannot avoid Error in searching it out; I shall thereby prove, that it could not be given to us by God as a common Rule of things to be believed.

This obscurity and difficulty ariseth from three Causes. The first is the amplitude of the Church diffused throughout the whole World; which permits not the Faith of all Pastors to be known, unless we travel through all those Regions, wherein they are dispersed. For it sufficeth not to consult a few. They may be mistaken. The Opinion of all must be asked, the consent

sent of all appear. But how shall they be all singly consulted? Who ever learned the Christian Faith this way? Yet this way Card. Richieu² points out to us. He saith, the uniformity of the Church is manifest to sense; that all parts of the Church may be surveyed by one man at divers times, or by divers men at one time. True; but to reduce this to practice, every single man must take so many Journeys, send out so many Intelligencers; that this Method cannot be perswaded but in jeast. *Valentia*⁴ the Jesuit is more ingenuous, who confesseth, that it can rarely happen that it may be sufficiently known what is the Opinion in Religion of all Doctors living at the same time. And this he understands in respect of the Pope himself, as appears from what follows these words. If then the consent of Doctors can rarely be known by the Pope, who hath his Nuncio's and Emisseries in all places, how shall it ever be known by private Men? *Tanner*⁵ saith the same thing, as he is cited by *Martinoni*. If it were necessary, saith he, that all private men should know evidently what is believed in the whole Church, how many years must be spent in acquiring that Evidence, which even learned men have not always. And *Martinoni*⁶ saith, The Pope may be certainly and easily consulted, not for the whole Church, no, not all her Passions only.

Si opus esset, ut plebei scirent evidenter in tota Ecclesia sic credi; quot anni laborarent, dum istam evidentiam acquirerent, quam neque periti semper habent? *Tann.* apud *Mart. de fide disp. 3. Sect. 4.* *Certo ex facile potest consuli Pontifex, non sic tota Ecclesia, ne quidem omnes illius Pastores.* *Mart. de fide disp. 9. Sect. 9.*

This may be proved by many Examples, of which I will produce some few. *Rutherfurd*⁷ and *Valentia*⁸ assert, that all Divines agree concerning the punishment of Infants dying without Baptism, and think it only *pæna damni* undergone in that which they call the *Limbus puerorum*. Yet is this Opinion falsely by them ascribed to all, even Modern Divines (for among the Ancients *St Fulgentius* is known to have taught the contrary.) *Florentinus Cournus*, Titular Arch-bishop of *Tuam*, published a Book, wherein he endeavoured to prove the contrary, approved by fourteen Doctors of Divinity; whereof one *Fr. Sylvius* testifieth *Cournus* his Opinion is the common Doctrine of the School of *Domay*: Another, *James Poller*, professeth, that for thirty years, wherein he had been conversant in the Divinity Schools, he had never heard any other Opinion taught by the Professors, than that unbaptized Infants are condemned to the eternal Torments of Hell. A

third,

⁹ *Quam S. Augustini sententiam verissimam semper iudicavi, defendi & docui tanquam antiquioribus Ecclesiae doctoribus conformem, & semper hucusque ab excellentissimis quibusdam doctis, utpote Scripturam magis innixam & Conciliis.*

Of Indulgences our Adversaries teach chiefly three things. I. That there is a Treasure of the Satisfaction of Christ and the Saints, which may be applied to persons liable to suffer the punishment of their sins, after the guilt of them is remitted in the Sacrament of Penance; and that this Treasure is actually applied by Indulgences granted by the Pope. II. That the Souls in Purgatory may be helped by these Indulgences. III. That by them is remitted not only the punishment enjoined in Penance, and decreed by the Canons of the Church, but also that which is due at the Tribunal of God. These three things *Bellarmin* and *Valentia* affirm to be taught by all Divines. Although the first, *Bellarmin* confesseth, was doubted of by *Mairo* and *Durandus*, who thought the Satisfaction of Saints have no part in

that Treasure; but the contrary, saith he ¹⁰, is the common Opinion of the other Divines, as well Ancient, as of all the Modern, and was confirmed by a Decree of *Clement VI.* The Second he acknowledgeth was denied by *Hofiensis* and *Gabriel*; but saith, the latter corrected his Error, and that it is a thing most certain, and undoubted among Catholics. So *Valentia* ¹¹ saith, it is the assertion of all the Orthodox. As for the Third, *Valentia* affirms the contrary Opinion is exploded as erroneous by all the Orthodox. Who could imagine after all this, there were any doubt concerning these points among them? Yet *Holden* ¹² teacheth that this only is certain and undoubted, that the Governours of the Church can and ought sometimes to indulge something, and mitigate the severity of the Canons in each Tribunal. All the rest are doubtful, and disputed of by Divines on both parts, to wit, whether there be a Treasure, of which the Pope and other Pastors of the Church are dispensers, &c. where he largely shews that all these Propositions are many ways doubted of, and wholly uncertain among Divines.

¹⁰ *Communis aliorum Theologorum tum antiquorum tum recentiorum omnium sententia. Bell. de Indulg. lib. 1. cap. 2. Res certissima, & apud Catholicos indubitata.*
¹¹ *Val. tom. 4. disp. 7. qu. 20. punct. 5.*

¹² *Cetera omnia dubia sunt, & à Theologis in utramque partem agitata. Hold. Anal. fid. lib. 2. cap. 6.*

If it be enquired, whether the Church can put Hereticks to death? *Kalensis* ¹³ answers, That 'tis not only certain, but of Faith, that the Church can lawfully and conveniently do it. *Holden* ¹⁴ on the contrary maintains, That to inflict death upon convicted, relapsed, or even the most obstinate Hereticks, was never an Opinion of the Christian Religion and the Universal Church. Neither do all, even the most Pious and Learned Catholics, approve the use and methods of the Inquisition. The like saith *Richerius* ¹⁵. If again

¹³ *Ex fide certum est Ecclesiam licite & convenienter id facere posse. Val. tom. 3. disp. 1. qu. 11. punct. 3.*

¹⁴ *Nunquam fuit religioni Christiana & Ecclesiae Christianae dogma Catholicum. Nec omnes etiam piissimi & doctissimi Catholici inquisitionis usum & rationem approbant. Hold Anal. fid. l. 1. c. 9.*

¹⁵ *Rich. Hist. Concil. l. 1. c. 10.*

it be enquired, whether the corruption of humane nature, introduced by sin, consists only in the loss of supernatural Graces, or also includes somewhat positive, whereby the Soul is vitiated? *Rhodius* ¹⁶ answers in the first sence, and affirms, That all the Orthodox Divines so teach against all the Sectaries. *Bellarmin* ¹⁷: That it is taught by the common consent of all. Yet *Vasquez* ¹⁸ attributes the contrary Opinion to many Divines of great name, as *Holcot*, *Greg. Ariminensis*, *Gabriel*, *Henricus*, *Gulielmus Parisiensis*, *Antistiodorensis*, *Driedo*.

¹⁶ *Ita contra sectarios omnes docent Orthodoxi omnes Theologi. Rhod. de pecc. disc. 4. qu. 2. Sect. 3.*

¹⁷ *Omnes communi consensu docent. Bell. de grat. primi hom. cap. 5.*

¹⁸ *Vasq. l. 1. 2. disp. 132. cap. 4. & 5.*

It is a Famous Question, whether the Pope, besides the Spiritual Power, commonly attributed to him, hath a power over Temporals, either direct or indirect, whereby he deposes Princes for Heresie, or any other Crime, and absolve their Subjects from their Allegiance. There are three Opinions about this. The first is, that the Pope hath, *jure divino*, a direct and absolute Power over the whole World, as well in Temporals, as in Spirituals. The Second, that the Pope, as Pope, hath no Temporal Power, nor any Authority to deprive Princes. The Third, that the Pope, as Pope, hath not directly any Temporal, but only Spiritual Power; yet that by means of that Spiritual, he hath indirectly a Supreme Power even in Temporals. *Bellarmin* ¹⁹, who relateth these three Opinions in these very words, attributes the first to many of the Canonists: the third he makes the common Opinion of Catholick Divines: The second he saith is not so much an Opinion as an Heresie, and therefore he ascribes it only to *Calvin*, *P. Martyr*, *Brentius*, and the *Magdeburgenses*: And in another place, under the feigned

¹⁹ *Bell. de Pont. lib. 5. cap. 1.*

name of *Adolphus Sebullenius*, he teacheth the same thing, where he inveigheth ²⁰ against *Maddington* (a defender of the second Opinion) as opposing the *14* Scriptures, the Doctrine of Councils and Popes, and the unanimous consent of Fathers and Doctors, who all with one Accord teach the Pope's Supreme Power in Temporals; and thereby ranking himself with Hereticks and Schismaticks, while he pretends to be a Catholic. Thus *Bellarmin*. Now on the other side, *De Alanca* and *Launcy* contend this Opinion was always unknown in France. The whole *Synod* in the Exposition of their Judgment published in the Year 1663 testify, That not only they never received this Opinion, but always resisted it with their utmost power. Not to say, that the Kings of France, and Parliaments of Paris by their Edicts and Arrests often condemned it, and forbid it to be held or taught, particularly in the Years 1561, 1594, 1595, 1610, 1614, &c.

²⁰ *Contra S. Heteras doctrinam consiliorum & summorum pontificum unanimem consensum patrum & doctorum hæreticis schismaticisque se jungit. Apud Widd. contra Schulk. §. 15.*

I might produce many more examples; but these suffice to shew, That the greatest Doctors mistake in imagining some Opinions to be approved by all the Divines of their Communion, which yet are freely disputed of on both sides. And if this happens to Doctors, who employ their whole time in matters of learning, what shall we think of poor and illiterate Men, who know little beyond the providing for the necessities of this life? Again, If the Judgment of only those Doctors, who commit their Opinions to Writing, and are very few in comparison of the rest, is not certainly known; how shall we know the Judgment of those who teach their Flocks *vis à voce*? Lastly, If their Opinion be true, who would have the Judgment not only of Bishops, but also of Parsons, Professors of Divinity, and Preachers to be accounted of? what hope is there, that the Opinion of so many Men should ever be known to any one Man, or to any but God alone?

The second Reason of the difficulty of knowing the common consent of other Doctors, is, the obscure Knowledge which is in the Church, of some points, concerning which no Disputation hath been yet raised. For nothing is more true, than that Opinions are illustrated by Controversies. So *Se.*

²¹ *Multa ad fidem Catholicam Augustini* ²² *faith, many things pertaining to* *pertinentia dum hæreticorum callida iniquitudine agitantur, ut adversum eos defendi possint, & consideratione diligentius, & intelleguntur, clarius & instantius predicantur, & ab adversariis magis quæstio existit discendi occasio.* *August. de Civit. Dei, lib. 16. chap. 20.*

Catholic Faith, while they are disposed of by the cunning perverseness of Hereticks, that they be defended against them, are considered more diligently, understood more clearly, and preached more earnestly; the Question moved by the Adversary becoming an occasion of learning. This he proves in another place²² by the Doctrines of the Trinity, Penance and Baptism, not fully handled before the Controversies started in them by the *Arians*, *Novatians*, and *Rebaptizers*: And therefore *Valentinus*²³ affirms, It belongs to the Church, as necessary shall require, to deliver anew to the Faithful more explicitly, and by an Infallible Authority, as it were drawn out of darkness those truths of Faith, which were indeed at first delivered by the Apostles; but now either by the negligence or perversity of Men lay hid. And perhaps, saith he, some do yet lay hid in the Church. An eminent example of this appeared in the Council of *Trent*; when they were seeking out an efficacious remedy against the inconveniencies of clandestine Marriages. Some advised the declaring them void for the future; and these were the major number. Fifty Bishops, and among them the Patriarch of *Hierusalem*, and two of the Legates, *Card. Hofius* and *Simoneira*, opposed it, saying, That was not in the power of the Council. *Straw* the Legate, and many others suspended their Votes. The Disputations grew high; at last they agreed to refer all to the Pope. He answered, the Council had Power to make such a Decree, and that it ought to be made. Hereupon clandestine Marriages were declared void; and an *Anathema* added to the Decree against all those who should thenceforth deny the Church hath power to make Constitutions of that nature. See a Power residing in the Church now become an Article of Faith, which was vehemently impugned by a Patriarch, two Legates, fifty Bishops, and doubted of by many others. And shall those now be heard, who maintain there is always in the Church a clear and distinct knowledge of all things revealed?

²² In Psalm 34.

²³ Val. tom. 3.

disp. 1. quæst.

1. punct. 6.

Et fortasse latent adhuc in

Ecclesia aliquæ.

We proceed to the third Reason, which consisteth in this, That some Opinions are often divulged in the Church as revealed by God, and approved by the Church, and are everywhere taught, which at last are found out and known to be false. Monsieur *Pajon*²⁴ produceth three eminent Examples of this Observation; the first taken from the decisions of the *Canonists*, the second from the form of Condemnation of the *V.*

²⁴ Rép. aux
prejugés part.
2. chap. 2.

Jansenian Propositions; the third from the Prohibition of reading the Bible; which because he largely and accurately pursueth, I will not here urge; much less will add other Examples before pointed out in this Chapter. However, from what hath been said, it appears, that it is obscure and difficult to be known wherein the Doctors consent. This will be more manifest, if we consider, that it is far more difficult to know certainly what all the present Doctors teach, than what the former Doctors taught. For the Opinions of these we have in their Books, which we can read at home; but to know the Judgment of the others we must travel through the whole World. *Valentia* supposeth this very thing, where he giveth the reason why the Pope in defining rather maketh use of dead than living Doctors:

²⁵ *Qui proinde omnes nec facile congregari nec interrogari possunt quid sentiant. Val. Tom. disp. 1. quest. 1. punct. 7. §. 46.*

Because, saith he, the Opinion of these latter can very rarely be sufficiently known. For being dispersed through the whole Church, they cannot all easily be either assembled, or asked what they think; whereas the ancient Doctors are more famous, and are not so many.

If this be true, how difficult must it be to know the Judgment of the present Church; since the most learned Men can very hardly obtain the Sense of the Ancient Church? Few or none can search all the Monuments of Antiquity, pry into the most secret Recesses of it, and turn over the Writings of sixteen Ages; and in all this long Journey make no slips, commit no errors: Yet is all this easier in the Judgment of *Valentia*, than to enquire and find out the Opinion of the Doctors living at any one time; which yet must be done by them, who lay the Foundation of their Faith upon their consent.

I have not yet seen any of our Adversaries, who offereth the least solution of any one of these difficulties, except Cardinal *Richliu*; who when he had objected to himself, That blind Men hear neither all Preachers and Doctors, nor learn from those, which they do hear, what the others teach, which is our very Argument, except that what he saith only of Blind-men, we justly apply to all Men; he answers, ²⁶ That as for a Philosopher to conclude all Fires to be hot, it is not necessary that he experiments all the Fires in the World, the common consent of Philosophers sufficing: so to know certainly, whether any Doctrine be the Doctrine of the Church is abundantly sufficient, that Blind-men bear it proposed by divers Doctors of the Church, and that it cannot be shown there are others who teach the contrary.

²⁶ *Method. liv. 2. chap. 8.*

But many things may be here observed. First, Those things do not always suffice in matter of Faith, with which we are contented in disputing. There we often argue from Concessions, which we own to be false: Here nothing is to be produced but what is true and certain. Wherefore if no body oppose those Doctrines which seem true to us, it doth not follow that we ought to admit them, unless they be both certain of themselves, and appear so to us: And if no body points out to us any maintainers of the contrary Doctrine, it doth not therefore follow, that there are none; whence the Doctrine propos'd, obtains not thence any certainty, any motive of Faith. Secondly, Philosophers themselves admonish, great diligence is to be used in making Arguments of *Induction*, such as this is; and that an insufficient enumeration of particulars is the great fountain of Errors; while a few, or even many, are reckoned up, and thence a conclusion made of all. Wherefore he reasons not well, who argues thus, *Such and such teach thus; nor doth any appear who opposeth, Therefore all teach the same.* For it may easily be that many may teach otherwise, unknown to him who reasons thus, but well known to others.

In the next place, it were to be desired the Cardinal had explained his mind more clearly, and told by whom he means it cannot be shewn that other teach the contrary; whether by the blind Man himself, or by other blind or ignorant Men like himself, or by one Learned Man whom he should consult, or by all Learned men every where dispersed. If he means the first or second, then he greatly errs in thinking it sufficient that the blind Man or other ignorant Persons of his acquaintance cannot name any, who teach a contrary Doctrine to their Parish-Priest or those Doctors whom they hear. For all the Husbandmen, Labourers, and Mechanicks of the Parish may be easily ignorant, that a contrary Doctrine, and that more true, is taught in *America* or *India* or even the next Province; and so the blind Man shall be obliged to believe a falsity. But if the Cardinal means it suffice, that the blind Man consult some learned Man to know, whether none teacheth contrary to his Parson; I would ask, whether our Adversary requireth it as necessary? If so, then all the common sort of the Faithful are guilty of rashness and imprudence. For I dare swear that none of them ever puts this in practice. If he saith it is not necessary;

cessary, he deserts the cause. For upon what foundation shall their Faith rely, who do not that which he confesseth not necessary to be done, and yet think sufficient to confirm their Faith? But what if the Doctor, who is consulted, be in the same error with the Parish-Priest, as none will deny he easily may? It cannot be imagined that Doctor will tell the consulter the thing is not taught by the Church, which himself thinks to belong to Faith. Or what if that Doctor be ignorant that others, and those Learned Men teach the contrary; as we proved might easily happen in the precedent chapter? That answer surely cannot be sufficient to ground Faith upon, which can be false. For as *Martinus* * truly saith. To believe with undoubting and Infallible Faith, such is Divine Faith, is required an Infallible Argument. Lastly, that the Cardinal meaneth it sufficeth that none in the World can shew the Parson teacheth what is repugnant to others, I can never be induced to believe, since a more foolish fence could not be invented. For not the most sagacious Person, much less a blind Man, could make so diligent an inquiry as to be assured that none such can be found in the whole World. Add hereto, that it is not more difficult to know directly whether any do teach otherwise, than to know whether there be any who can shew that it is any where taught otherwise: And so all our former Arguments will return with their full force against this answer. But to omit all this, I ask whether any ignorant Person using such diligence to inquire whether what is taught by his Parson, is taught unanimously by all the other Governours of the Church, as can be expected from a Man of his circumstances and capacity, can be deceived therein? If he cannot; all those Learned Men, whom I mentioned in the last Chapter will be guilty of a most intolerable negligence and supinuity, as being mistaken in that, wherein even the most ignorant cannot be deceived. If he can, then he is not certain, and therefore hath no Faith. For Faith must be certain.

* Ad credendum fide indubitata & infallibilis, qualis est fides divina, requiritur argumentum infallibile. Mart. de diip. 3. sect. 4.

CHAP. XXII.

That it doth not suffice it be known that any thing is taught Unanimously by the Governours of the Church, unless it appear that it is taught to be of Faith. But that this is most uncertain.

FROM what hath been said it is manifest, that neither do the Governours of the Church always consent; nor if they do, can their consent be certainly known. But suppose both. The controversy is not yet ended. For not whatsoever they unanimously affirm, is to be received as the revelation of God, and the Doctrine of the Church; but only what they unanimously maintain to be of Faith. This *Comius* and *Bellarmin* plainly insinuate: The first, * when he saith, *the Pastors of the Church cannot err in the Faith, but whatsoever they teach the faithful People, that it belongs to the Faith of Christ, is most delem populum true: Bellarmin: * ibid whatsoever all the Bishops teach as belon- docent, quod ad ging to Faith, is necessarily true and of Faith. Therefore, Flor. Christi fidem attineat. Can. Comius defends himself against the unanimous consent of loc. Theol. Doctors, who taught 500. Years since that unbaptized Infants lib. 4. cap. 4. were not punished with the torments of fire, by pretending * Id quod do- that they did not teach or propose this as of Faith. And indeed it cent tanquam cannot but be absurd, that the consent of Pastors should ad fidem perti- reach farther than the Infallibility of Pope, or Council, de nent. Bell. de Eccl. lib. 3. the Universal Church, which as we have before observed, is cap. 14. acknowledged not to take place, but in matters which they * Non tanquam fidem docue- propose as of Faith. Lastly, the Council of Trent, *Finis V.* rint aut propo- and divers Provincial Councils wished, that the Catechism of fuerint. Con- Trent might be admitted every where, and be used by all Pa- destatu parv. stors in the instruction of their people. Perhaps this is ob- cap. 19. served: For why should it not be? This whole Book then may be reckoned among those things which all Pastors propose to their flocks, not as pertaining to Faith, but as true and wholsom. If therefore, whatsoever all propose, must necessarily be true; there can be nothing false, nothing uncertain in this Book. Yet none will deny there are taught in it*

it many Propositions false, more uncertain, and none which might not safely be denied, if they received not their Authority from some other Fountain. Wherefore it is no where admitted as of Infallible authority; a manifest Argument, that those things may be false, which are not taught as of Faith, although taught unanimously.

Before we believe therefore the Doctrine of the Governors of the Church, we must consider how they teach it, whether as of Faith; if not, we must suspend our assent. Now Bishops, Parsons, and Preachers, are wont to teach what seems true to them, and agreeing with Divine Revelation; but very rarely to admonish whether what they teach be of Faith, or a consequent of Faith, whether expressly revealed, or coherent to things revealed. This *Holden* acknowledgeth.

* In Doctrinâ Christianâ tradendâ nunquam audivimus Ecclesiam articulorum revelatorum & divinarum institutionum Catalogum exhibuisse vel composuisse, quo separatim & distinctè cognosci possent hujusmodi fidei dogmata ab aliis omnibus, quæ vel Ecclesiasticæ sunt institutionis, vel certè quæ revelationi divine haud immèdiatè innitantur; atque adeo omnia simul confusè & indistinctè doctæ. *Hold.* Anal. fid. lib. 1. cap. 8.

We never heard, saith *he*, that the Church in delivering the Christian Doctrine exhibited, or composed a Catalogue of revealed Articles; and Divine Institutions, whereby these Articles of divine Faith might be separately and distinctly known from all others, which are either of Ecclesiastical Institution, or not immediately founded upon Divine Revelation, but taught all together confusedly and indistinctly. Hence even those Divines who agree in the truth of any Article, often differ in judging whether it be of

Faith; as we saw before concerning the supreme Power of the Pope. Wherefore *Holden* affirms there are much fewer Articles of Divine and Catholick Faith, than Divines commonly think; and therefore bestows the whole Latter part of his Analysis in composing a Catalogue of such Articles: which would indeed have been very useful, if it were received by all. But he hath omitted some things, which others contend to be of Faith; and inserted others, which some would have omitted. Further in this matter, I appeal to the experience of all Persons; who if they shall ask any of our Adversaries what the Church teacheth concerning Image worship, Invocation of Saints, or the like, will be convinced by their different answers, That it is not easie to say what the Church teacheth. And if this be difficult to learned Men, how shall it be possible to ignorant Persons?

Our Adversaries cannot justly pretend, as many of them do, that the Doctors may dissent in those things, which are of Theological, not Divine right, and belong rather to the Schools than to the Pulpit, without either the knowledge or the damage of the People; but cannot dissent in matters of Faith, unless their dissensions be presently known, because disputations, strifes and Schisms presently arise from them, which occasion either the Decree of a Pope or the calling of a Council to extinguish the dissension, and cast the heretical part out of the Church. That every Laick therefore, both may and ought to be perswaded of the truth of those things, which his Pastour teacheth to be of Faith, while he seeth none opposing him; although himself doth not inquire, whether others teach the same thing. So *Sharez* 5. But here many things are supposed which cannot be granted. First, it is not necessary, that as often as a Doctor proposeth any thing to be of Faith, which is not so, some others should rise to oppose him. We daily see the contrary not only in Parishes, but even in Universities, where the Wits of Men are more easily excited to controversy: yet there some affirm, others deny many matters to be of Faith, (without any subsequent Schisms or Animosities.

^s De fide disp.
^s Sect. 1.

Secondly, if any Disputation, or Opposition should arise herein; it is not necessary it should ever come to the ears of the common People. Every one knows how hot the Controversy about the Pope's Infallibility hath for some Ages been, especially in *France*, where are many Defenders of each Opinion. Yet some Years since, when I was in that Country, talking with a Priest, and him no ordinary Person, but a man famous in the neighbourhood, and Doctor of Divinity, when I said the Pope's Infallibility was denied by many, and particularly by the *Sorbon*, he grew very angry, said it was most false, and confidently maintained that no Catholick Divine ever doubted of it. Nor could I free the Man from his error, whatsoever I then offered to him. See another example more remarkable. I was present at *Paris* in an Assembly of Learned Men, who met weekly to treat of matters of learning. They then disputed of the Pope's Infallibility, which a Priest said was lately rejected by the *Gallican* Clergy in their Synod. At that an Abbot who presided over the Assembly, and had the repute of a very Learned Man, was not a little moved, and denied any such thing was ever done by the Clergy. He acknowledged indeed that the Pope could err, whensoever he gave his opinion as a Private

Doctor, and that the Clergy meant no more than this: but that there was no Catholick, who did not hold his judgment Infallible, whensoever he pronounced *ex cathedra*: and whatsoever the Priest could say, he would not be perswaded that there was any dissension among Divines in this matter. If this Learned Abbot could be ignorant of so notorious a thing; what shall we think of illiterate Christians?

Thirdly, it is not necessary, that as often as dissensions arise in matters of Faith, Schism should thence immediately be produced, and occasion a Decree of the Pope, or calling of a Council. How many things did *Theodorus of Mopsuestia* teach against the Faith, which yet were not canvassed of many Years after his Death? All acknowledge the number of Canonical Books of Scripture, the necessity of the Eucharist, and state of the Dead to be of Faith: Yet none will deny the Ancients differed in judgment as to all these things; and all know that no Schisms, Disputes, or Anathemas of Councils arose therefrom. But not to depart from this very question: What can be more of Faith, than the Rule of Faith it self, and the most essential condition of that Rule, Infallibility? Many Doctors of the Church denied this in the XIV. and XV. ages, as we before proved; yet no Schism, no Decree of the Church was occasioned thereby.

But to shew the sophistry of this objection more evidently, it may be observed, that there are five sorts of things, which, although not belonging to Faith, may be in the Church proposed as of Faith. I. Things true, but not revealed. II. Neither true nor revealed, but not repugnant to Revelation. III. Repugnant to things revealed, but such, as it is not manifest that they were revealed. IV. Repugnant to things manifestly revealed, but so as that repugnance is obscure and remote, not clear and immediate. V. Clearly repugnant to things manifestly revealed. Concerning matters of the last rank this objection might have some force, but not much: since the contrary may be shewn in some examples. But for the four first Classes it hath no colour of truth. They may be all taught as of Faith, and that, daily, yet be observed and regarded by none, much less violently opposed by any. The want of apparent opposition therefore sufficeth not to make what any one Doctor proposeth as of Faith, to be so. The consent and
con-

concurrence of all in teaching the same to be of Faith, must be ascertained. Otherwise assent to it will be foolish and rash, at least uncertain.

CHAP. XXIII.

That it is not certain those things are true, which are unanimously taught by all Pastors.

THAT it is uncertain, what the Governours of the Church unanimously teach, we have proved; yet grant it certain: Can we securely believe this their unanimous consent? What if they may all err? This our Adversaries will say they cannot. But is that certain and undoubted? If not, in vain is it alledged. They will perhaps say it is; nay, and of Faith, so as it cannot be denied without open Heresy. So *Dwall*, and many others. And indeed, if it be not of Faith that all the Pastors consenting cannot err, Faith cannot rely upon their Authority. Yet is this most false; for we before proved these two Propositions. I. That nothing is of Faith, whose contrary is held and taught by Catholick Divines, the Church knowing and not censuring their Opposition. II. That the greatest Divines of the Roman Church, Doctors, Bishops, and Cardinals taught; 1. That the whole Clergy might be infected with Heresy. 2. That the Church, to which Infallibility was promised, might consist in one Laick, or one Woman, the rest apostatizing from the Faith. This was the Opinion of *Alensis*, the Author of the *Gloss upon the Decretals*, *Lyra*, *Occam*, *Alliaco*, *Panormitan*, *Turrecremata*, *Peter de Monte*, *S. Antoninus*, *Cusanus*, *Clemangis*, *Jacobarius*, *J. Fr. Picus*. But who can imagin so many, and so great Men, either not to have known what is of Faith, or willingly to have taught the contrary?

This moved *Suarez* to esteem the Infallibility of the Pastors thus consenting uncertain. It is asked, saith he^a, whether all the Bishops of the Church can agree in any error? For among Catholicks, some as-
Petitur an omnes Episcopi Ecclesie possint convenire in aliquo errore. Nam inter Catholicos quidam affirmant, quia non invenitur promissio. Alii negant, quia, &c. Mihi vero neutrum videtur satis exploratum probabile autem est ad providentiam Christi pertinere, ut id non permittat. *Suar. de fide disp. 3. Sect. 6.*

firm it, because there is no promise found (of the contrary :) Others deny it, because the whole Church would be otherwise in great danger of error. To me neither seemeth sufficiently certain. Yet it is probable, that it becomes the Providence of Christ not to permit it. In these words two things may be observed. First, That Suarez speaks of the Infallibility of Bishops not in believing, but in teaching. For he saith this in answer to an Objection, That if all the Bishops could err, then the other part of the Church, the Laity, might also err, because they ordinarily follow the Doctrine of their Pastors, and are bound to do it. Now the People are bound to follow their Pastors, not in what they think, but in what they teach. This also appears from the reason why some denied the consent of all Bishops in any error to be possible, because, if that should happen the whole Church would be brought into great danger of error. But if Bishops should teach rightly, although they thought erroneously, there would be thence no danger of Error to the rest of the Faithful. Secondly, Of this Infallibility of Bishops in what they teach unanimously, he saith three things. 1. That some Catholics deny it. 2. That neither part seems certain to him. 3. That it is probable. All which singly prove, That he thought it not to be of Faith. But who can imagine so great a Doctor could be ignorant of what was of Faith?

Theoph. Raymandus differed not much from the Opinion of

3 *Ut, seposito capite visibili, membra omnia possint insci aliquo errore materiali, vix potest contingere; et verisimillimum est Deo semper curae futurum ne id accidat. Si tamen accideret, incontaminato capite, nihil decederet de perpetuitate verae fidei in Ecclesia.* Rayn. *ad 10a punct.* 5.

Suarez: That the visible Head, saith he, being laid aside, all the Members should be infected with any material error, could scarce happen; and as most probable God will take care it should not. Yet if it should happen, the Head being uninfected, the perpetuity of true Faith in the Church would suffer no loss: Where he determines not absolutely this cannot happen; but looks upon the contrary only as most probable; and denieth the Infallibility of the whole Church to depend thereon, which is so much urged by the maintainers of the contrary Opinion.

4 *Mortuo pontifice, non est in Pope being dead, the Church hath no Infallible Authority to make Decrees of Faith, as having no actual and immediate Infallibility at that time.*

Rhodius speaks more plainly, who affirms: 1. That the Church hath no Infallible Authority to make Decrees of Faith, as having no actual and immediate Infallibility at that time.

Nullam eo tempore infallibilitatem actualem & proximam habet Ecclesia. Rhod. de fide qu. 2. Sect. 5. §. 5.

Hence

Hence is manifest, that we want little of a Confession from our Adversaries, that the Infallibility of the Governours of the Church is not of Faith. And indeed it cannot be. For no Foundation of such a Faith is to be found: Not Scripture or Tradition. For not to say, that these, to make any Article become of Faith, ought, according to our Adversaries, most evidently to contain it; which evidence even they will not deny to be here wanting: It would be most absurd, that Papists should believe this Infallibility of the Pastors of the Church for the Authority of Scripture and Tradition; when they believe neither of these, but for the Authority of the Pastors. Take away their Testimony, and they will deny it to be known whether Scripture or Tradition be the word of God, or what is the sense of either. The same may be said of the Decrees of the Church Representative. For besides that no such express Decree of it can be produced, the Infallibility of the Representative Church it self is believed by every single Papist, only because they hear it taught by their Pastors. As for the belief of the Universal Church, that ought not be produced. For that is the thing now inquired, why the Universal Church believeth so?

Will our Adversaries therefore say, they believe their Pastors cannot err in teaching unanimously what is of Faith; because they so teach themselves? This they must recur to; for they have no other reason left of believing so: Yet nothing can be more absurd. For first, it is the constant Opinion of all Mankind, and a received Law among all Nations, that none should be Witness or Judge in his own Cause. Secondly, As we believe not any Man to be true and honest, till we be assured of his veracity and honesty from some other Testimony than his own: So it would be the highest imprudence to esteem those Infallible, who challenge that privilege to themselves; until their Infallibility be known to us from some other Argument than their own Testimony. Certainly our Adversaries will not permit even the Scripture, which is the word of God, and hath so many illustrious Characters of a Divine Original, to be believed for its own Testimony; and Christ openly professed, that if he bore Witness of himself, his Witness was not credible. Why then shall that be attributed to the Governours of the Church; which Christ denied to himself, and our Adversaries

⁵ Non ideo vera
docent Pastores,
quia vera cre-
dunt Auditores;
sed ideo vera
credunt Audito-
res, quia vera
docentibus as-
sentiantur. F.
Hallier de Hie-
rarch. l. 4. c. 2.
⁶ Cave existi-
mes unumquen-
quam, etiam
Theologum Do-
ctissimum, posse
quicquam cre-
dere sine autho-
ritate Ecclesie
et independen-
ter ab ea. Ba-
got. Instit.
Theol. l. 4.
c. 1. §. 1.
⁷ Hof. cont.
Brent.

Adversaries deny to the Word of God? Thirdly, The Question will return, whence the Pastors of the Church know that they cannot err? For they will not say, they know it because the Faithful believe it; since as Hallier⁵ well saith, *The Pastors do not therefore teach truly, because the Auditors believe truly; but the Auditors believe truly, because they assent to the Pastors teaching truly.* They cannot say, that they know it from Scripture or Tradition. For the truth of these, without the Authority of the Church is no more known to learned than to unlearned persons. Think not, saith Bagoius⁶, that anyone, even the most learned Divine, can believe any thing without the Authority of the Church, and independently from it. And Hofius⁷ goeth so far, that he maintains it to be the best way, that even the most learned Men should recurr to implicit Faith, and believe only in general as the Church believeth. Shall the Pastors therefore believe, that they cannot err for their own Testimony? This is the natural consequence of our Adversaries Doctrine, and that most absurd. For first, there is none of the Pastors which believeth so, because he teacheth so; but all teach so, because all believe so. Again, The Question will recurr upon what Foundation do they teach so? Here either nothing, or only this must be answered, That they teach so because they believe so. Then if you ask why they believe so? no other answer can be given, than because they believe so; which is so foolish, as that I need not urge it any farther.

C H A P. XXIV.

That the Faith of all single Christians cannot rely upon the Faith of the Universal Church; because, first, it appears not who belong to that Church, which is thought Infalible.

THUS far have we considered the Faith of the Universal Church, as it is taught by the Pastors or Clergy. It remains that we treat of it as it is believed both by Clergy and Laity; which is the last refuge of our Adversaries. Here I undertake to prove, That there is nothing whereon the Faith of all private Christians can less rely; and that for three reasons. 1. Because it doth not appear what is that Universal Church,

Church, whose Faith is to be the Rule of ours. 2. Because it is not known what is the Faith of that Church. 3. Because it is not manifest whether the Faith of any Church assignable, be true.

The first is evinced two ways. For first, it is uncertain what is the true Idea or Definition of the Church, what is required to constitute it, whether only an external profession of the true Faith, or also internal Faith and Piety: And then although this were certain, it would be yet unknown, whether the *Roman*, *Greek*, or any other, were that true Church. As for the first, our Adversaries would persuade us, That they agree in the notion of a true Church. Yet nothing is more manifest than their discord in this matter. There are chiefly three Opinions of them herein: For if we should make an exact enumeration of them, we should find many more. The first teacheth, That the Church is made up of all persons baptized, and outwardly professing the true Faith, and adhering to the Pope of *Rome*, whether they be truly Faithful, or secretly Infidels. The second to an External Profession, requires Internal Faith, at least in form, to be added as necessary; and thereby excludes all secret Infidels and Hereticks. The third requireth Charity to be added to these two, and leaveth no place in the Church, but to those who are truly just, and free from Mortal Sin.

The first Opinion is defended by many, particularly *Camus*, *Bellarmin*, *Duvall*, and almost all the later writers of Controversy, especially the *French*. The second is taught by many: For all those seem to favour it, who define the Church to be the Congregation of the Faithful; of whom *Launoy*¹ reckons up a very great number. But it is openly and manifestly taught by *Alensis*, *Clemangis*, *Turrecremata*, and *Jacobatus*; while in the places formerly cited they assert, That the Church may be reduced to one only Woman, as it actually was at the time of our Saviour's Passion. The University of *Cracow* produced by *Launoy*², defined the Church to be a *Mystical*, *Organical* Body, animated by the Faith of Christ, constituted by all baptized persons, having the Faith of Christ either in form or formal. The same Opinion is accu-

¹ Laun. Epist. Tom. 8. ad Gattin.

² Ubi supra.

³ Est Ecclesia Corpus mysticum, organicum, sive Christi animatum, — Ex quo fit quod omnes baptizati, habentes fidem Christi sive informem sive formatam, constituunt Ecclesiam militantem.

rately

- 4 Suar. de fide disp. 9. Sect. 2.
 5 Arr. de fide disp. 7. Sect. 2.
 6 Casp. de fide disp. 2. Sect. 2. 9.

7 Catechumeni simpliciter pertinent ad Ecclesiam invisibilem; siquidem sunt membra Christi per Charitatem; sed ad Ecclesiam visibilem secundum quid, viz. per votum & desiderium. Bann. in 2. 2. qu. 1. art. 10. p. 47.

8 Ecclesia licet sit Respublica quædam visibilis, requirit tamen aliquid invisibile, sc. fidem. Hæretici ergo extra eam sunt, cum fidem non habent. Id. comm. ful. in art. 10. p. 90.

9 Fideles peccatores sunt verè partes Ecclesie militantis. Id. Comm. brev. p. 47.

10 Ecclesia habet lapides, sc. fideles; qui sicut per cementum lapis jungitur lapidi, sic per charitatem junguntur sibi. Hug. lib. C. Serm. Serm. 3.

11 Ecclesia sancta corpus est Christi cum spiritu vivificata, & unita fide una, & sanctificata. — Hæc itaque nomen significat membra Christi participantia Spiritum Christi. Id. de Sacr. part. 2. cap. 2.

12 Secundo modo sumitur Ecclesia pro congregatione bonorum fidelium, qui sunt per charitatem Christo incorporati. Hæc est Ecclesia, quæ regitur à Sp. S. corpus Christi mysticum, quod vegetatur spiritu ejus, pro quò Christus oravit, ne fides deficeret. Ant. Summ. Theol. part. 3. tit. 12. c. 1.

13 Manifestum est hoc corpus Ecclesie, quod ita se habuit, ex prædestinatis tantum constitui — Existentes in gratia presentis iustitiae solum de Ecclesia esse censentur. Cui. Concord. lib. 1. cap. 4.

rately and largely defended by Suarez 4, Ariaga 5, and Caspensis 6 among the Moderns.

The third Opinion seemeth to be favoured by Bannes 7, while he saith, *The Catechumens simply belong to the Invisible Church, as being members of Christ through Charity; but to the Visible Church only in part, viz. in wish and desire.* But he inclineth more to the second, in these words 8, *The Church, although it be a visible Commonwealth, requireth somewhat invisible, to wit, Faith.* Hereticks; therefore, as wanting that, are out of the Church. And in another place 9, *The Faithful which are Sinners, are truly parts of the Church Militant.* But to omit Bannes, the third Opinion is openly maintained by Hugo à Sancto Victore, whose words are these 10: *The Church hath Stones, to wit, the Faithful, who as one Stone is joined to another by Cement, are joined to the Church by Charity.* And in another place 11, *The Holy Church is the Body of Christ, quickened by one Spirit, and united by one Faith, and sanctified.* This word therefore significeth the Members of Christ partaking of the Spirit of Christ. Antoninus of Florence, after he had said, *The Church is sometimes taken for the General Collection of the Faithful,* subjoins these words 12, *In the second place the Church is taken for the Congregation of Good Believers, who are incorporated into Christ by Charity.* This is that Church which is governed by the Holy Ghost, the Mystical Body of Christ, which is animated by his Spirit, for which Christ prayed, that her Faith should not fail. The same saith Cusanus 13, *It is manifest that this Body of the Church, which is thus disposed (which adhereth to Christ in Spirit, in which the Spirit dwells, quickning the whole Body) is made up only of Predestinate Persons. Only those persons therefore, who continue in the Grace of present Righteousness are accounted to be of the Church.* Dionysius

myſtus Carthufianus ¹⁴ brings in Chriſt thus ſpeaking. I will build and confirm my Church, that is, the Congregation of the Faithful, by inſeparably uniting their hearts to me by Faith, Charity, and Grace; ſo as all may be one myſtical Body, and one Houſe. *J. Fr. Picus Mirandula* ¹⁵ ſaith, That we ought not to recede from the proper ſignification of the Word; that ſo that might be called primarily, properly, and moſt principally the Holy Catholick Church, which comprehendeth all men of a right and Apoſtolick Faith and unfeigned Charity. Ferus upon thoſe words, *Matth. XV.*

The gates of Hell ſhall not prevail againſt it, faith ¹⁶, Chriſt ſpeaks not here of the Church as it is commonly underſtood of the Collection of all Chriſtians, whether good or bad, but of the Church according to the Spirit, which comprehendeth only the Elect. Laſtly,

Chr. Lupus ¹⁷ affirms, That the Church which received the Keys, is not the univerſal Communion of the Faithful in the Lawful Sacraments, but the ſole Congregation of the juſt, or the Communion of Saints. Which he purſueth at large, and proveth by many Testimonies of *St. Auguſtine*; to which we might add many others no leſs cogent of other Fathers; as *St. Hierom*, *Agobardus*, *Bernard*, &c. if our Argument conſiſted in the truth of this Opinion. It ſufficeth to ſhew it was received by many; and conſequently that our Adverſaries do not agree in forming the Idea of a Church.

Now this Diſſenſion is of great moment. For if the ſecond, or eſpecially the third Opinion be true, the Doctrine of our Adverſaries will be wholly overthrown. For not to ſay, that if Sinners be excluded out of the Church, the Pope and whole Councils may perhaps not belong to it, and ſo want that Infallibility which is appropriated to the true Church. To omit this, ſince we treat not now of active but paſſive Infallibility, I ſay, That according to this Hypotheſis, the Faith of our Adverſaries cannot rely upon the belief of the Univerſal Church. For to conform themſelves to this Rule of Faith, they muſt firſt perfectly know it; which cannot be, if they know not what is that Church, whoſe Faith they ought to follow. But how ſhall they know the Church, if that conſiſt only of Pious Men, whom none will deny to be known to God alone? *Catus* was not ig-

¹⁴ *Edificabo & confirmabo Eccleſiam meam, id eſt, congregationem fidelium, corda eorum per fidem, charitatem & gratiam mihi inſeparabiliter connellendo; ita ut omnes ſint unum corpus myſticum, unaque domus.* Carth. in *Matth. XVI.* art. 26.

¹⁵ A propria vocabuli ſignificatione recedendum ipſe non putarem; at primò & propriè principaliffimèque Sancta Catholica Eccleſia diceretur, qua omnes reſta & Apoſtolica fidei & non ſiſta charitatis homines compleſſeretur. Pic. Theor. 13.

¹⁶ Sed loquitur de Eccleſiâ ſecundum ſpiritum, qua ſola electos compleſſitur. Fer. in *Matth.*

¹⁷ *Eccleſia qua claves accepit, non eſt univerſa fidelium in legitimis Sacramentis communio, ſed ſola congregatio juſtorum, ſeu Sanctorum communio.* Lup. in *Concil. rom.* 4. p. 818.